

ATTACHMENT II

LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGY INNOVATIONS FUND - PROGRESS REPORT

9/1/00

I DEPARTMENT/AGENCY

Louisiana Department of Education

II PROJECT TITLE

Department of Education WEB-based Data Warehouse System

III PROJECT LEADER

Steve Jungk, Department of Education, Education Data Center, 3455 Florida Blvd. Baton Rouge, La., 70806, Phone-225-342-2505, FAX 225-342-1524, sjungk@mail.doe.state.la.us

IV DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This is a project to develop and implement a WEB-accessed Education Data Warehouse (EDW). The overall goal of the system is to improve student achievement and teacher quality by providing educational administrators and teachers access to the data they need to make effective decisions. The primary system users are district principals and teachers as well as state and district administrators. Other users include legislators, community leaders and the public at large.

V PROJECT STATUS

A. Brief Summary

Work on the project is proceeding somewhat slower than planned

B. Accomplishments

?? The Request for Proposal (RFP) was mailed by State Purchasing on 8/18/00.

?? A Pre-Proposal conference was held on 8/30/00.

?? Bid opening was held on 10/27/00.

?? Vendor presentations were held 1/16/01 through 1/18/01.

?? Vendor selection made 2/28/00.

C. Problems Encountered/Action Taken or Planned

?? OCR and OSP had difficulty determining which PST would review our RFP. The original RFP was sent to OSP to be reviewed by their PST. OSP determined that the RFP should be reviewed by the OCR PST. The OCR PST determined that the RFP should be reviewed by the OSP PST. The OSP finally agreed to review the PST. This process took considerable time and required us to essentially write two RFPs, one under the OCR format and one under the OSP format. I would recommend that the two PST's merge since there are members that sit on both committees and the criteria used to determine jurisdiction between the two committees is extremely vague.

?? The hiring/budget freeze imposed on our agency reduced the available manpower we were able to muster in writing the RFP. This delayed the completion of the RFP.

?? The bid opening date was delayed three weeks since several prospective bidders requested a delay because of the complexity of the project

?? Another delay was incurred because of the need for more information from the top bidders. Presentations were set up, but the end-of-the-year holidays produced another two-week delay in the process, as the vendors were unable to schedule presentations until after the new year.

D. Major Milestones (Original vs. Current Estimate)

Our original 50% completion figure was based on the RFP issuance sometime in May/June of 2000. The RFP was issued on 8/18/00. We had anticipated Proposal opening date to be sometime in July/August. The bid opening date was scheduled for 10/6/00, but it was delayed until 10/27/00. Currently, with the selection of a vendor, we are 10% complete.

VI COST VS. BUDGET

	<u>Category</u>	<u>Budgeted</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Projected Surplus</u>
A.	Equipment	\$ none	N/A	N/A
B.	Software	\$ none	N/A	N/A
C.	Telecommunications	\$ none	N/A	N/A
D.	Professional/ Contract Services	\$ 1,000,000	none as yet	none as yet
E.	Other Costs	\$ none	N/A	N/A
		=====	=====	=====
	Total Project Cost	\$ 1,000,000	none as yet	none as yet

VII ITEMIZED EXPENSES AND FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS INCURRED DURING THIS REPORTING PERIOD

None.

